

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TAMRA CULTON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:22-cv-12102

v.

Honorable Susan K. DeClercq  
United States District Judge

UNIFI AVIATION, LLC,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME  
TO FILE AN APPEAL (ECF No. 66)**

In 2022, Tamra Culton sued her former employer, Unifi Aviation, for creating a hostile work environment, discriminating against her because of her race and sex, and retaliating against her, all in violation of Title VII and Michigan’s Elliot-Larsen Civil Rights Act. ECF No. 1. On September 27, 2024, this Court granted summary judgment for Unifi and dismissed Culton’s Amended Complaint with prejudice. ECF Nos. 54; 55. On October 24, 2024, the Clerk of Court filed a Taxed Bill of Cost, which taxed an amount of \$4,374.85 against Culton, attributable to court-reporter fees. ECF No. 57.

Culton then sought reconsideration of this Court’s September 27 Opinion and Order and review of the Clerk’s taxation. ECF Nos. 58; 60. This Court denied both motions in an Opinion and Order on January 24, 2025. ECF No. 63.

Now, more than 30 days after this Court denied reconsideration, Culton moves for an extension of time to file an appeal. ECF No. 66. Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(5)(A) permits a district court to extend the time for filing a notice of appeal if: (i) the party moves for an extension no later than 30 days after the expiration of time to file; and (ii) that party shows excusable neglect or good cause.

Plaintiff argues that this Court should grant an extension based on the following:

Plaintiff's counsel did not become aware of the ruling until receiving an email from opposing counsel regarding costs, a situation that resulted from an unintentional oversight rather than a deliberate failure to act. In addition, counsel is currently nine months pregnant and preparing for maternity leave, which further contributed to the inadvertent delay.

ECF No. 66 at PageID.1195. But this explanation accounts for only *one* of Plaintiff's attorneys. *Id.* In fact, there are *four* attorneys representing Plaintiff in this matter—all of whom receive filing notifications as a counsel of record. The motion fails to demonstrate excusable neglect or good cause as to any of the other three. *See id.* This Court is unconvinced that the delay in this matter is excusable and will therefore deny the motion for extension.

### III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for an Extension to File an Appeal, ECF No. 66, is **DENIED**.

/s/Susan K. DeClercq  
SUSAN K. DeCLERCQ  
United States District Judge

Dated: March 19, 2025